REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and remarks contained herein in response to the Office Action mailed March 28, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 19 are pending. In particular, Applicants amend claims 1, 6, and 11. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Truong spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during a telephone discussion on June 12, 2007 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Truong and Mr. Bonner discussed potential arguments and amendments with regard to claim 1, in view of *Knauerhase*. The general thrust of the potential principal arguments included a discussion of at least one embodiment of the present application disclosing an IM launch option. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Truong carefully consider this response and the amendments.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. *Knauerhase in view of Cooperman*

1. Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0223069 ("*Cooperman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of

Cooperman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically,

claim 1 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location,
> comprising:
>> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an
> instant messaging (IM) address of a contact of a sender;
>> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an
> email address of the contact of the sender;
>> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a
> reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to
> identify the contact of the sender;
>> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the IM
> address to the reference identifier;
>> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the
> email address to the reference identifier (ID); and
>> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an
> email receive window configured to display a received email, the email
> receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for
> launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window,
> ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching
> the IM session***.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a

"method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the

computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a

received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for

launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, ***the email receive***

window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session" as recited in claim 1, as

amended. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses "systems and techniques… that enable a

sender to send a message to a recipient's identity rather than, e.g., one or more device

addresses associated with the recipient" (page 1, paragraph [0014]). Applicants respectfully

submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an

email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window

configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact

from the email receive window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for***

launching the IM session" as recited in claim 1, as amended, for at least the reason that sending a message to a recipient's identity is different than an email receive window that includes a launch IM option. Additionally, *Knauerhase* discloses that "a user may send a text message – either an e-mail message or an 'instant message' (IM) – to another user... IMs , in contrast, are messages that, if enabled, typically appear instantaneously in a pop-up window on the recipient's monitor" (page 1, paragraph [0003]). However, Applicants respectfully submit that a pop-up window for an Instant messages is different than an email receive window that includes an IM launch window. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Cooperman* discloses "an IM client application that receives request to initiate IM conversations and, in response to the requests, displays a notification window..." (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 1, as amended, for at least the reason that displaying a notification window is different than an email receive window including a launch IM option. Additionally, nowhere else does *Cooperman* even suggest "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the

email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that neither reference suggests "an email receive window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase* and *Cooperman* is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason that none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*," claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

2. Claims 2 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0223069 ("*Cooperman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 2 – 5. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 5 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

B. *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Cooperman*

1. Claim 6 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Cooperman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and U.S Patent Application Number 2005/0223069 ("*Cooperman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, sender input, the sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID); and
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses "systems and techniques... that enable a sender to send a message to a recipient's identity rather than, e.g., one or more device addresses associated with the recipient" (page 1, paragraph [0014]). Applicants respectfully

submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session***" as recited in claim 6, as amended, for at least the reason that sending a message to a recipient's identity is different than an email receive window that includes a launch IM option. Additionally, *Knauerhase* discloses that "a user may send a text message – either an e-mail message or an 'instant message' (IM) – to another user... IMs , in contrast, are messages that, if enabled, typically appear instantaneously in a pop-up window on the recipient's monitor" (page 1, paragraph [0003]). However, Applicants respectfully submit that a pop-up window for an Instant messages is different than an email receive window that includes an IM launch window. For at least these reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Donovan* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Knauerhase*. More specifically *Donovan* discloses "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, ***an email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) ***for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 6, as amended, for at least the reason that an IM session manager is different than an email window configured for launching an IM session. For at least this reason, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured

14

to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Cooperman* discloses "an IM client application that receives request to initiate IM conversations and, in response to the requests, displays a notification window…" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended, for at least the reason that displaying a notification window is different than an email receive window including a launch IM option. Additionally, nowhere else does *Cooperman* even suggest "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

2.   Claim 11 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in View of *Donovan* and *Cooperman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and U.S Patent Application Number 2005/0223069 ("*Cooperman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this

rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. More specifically, claim 11 recites:

> A system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising:
> first receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the first receive logic configured to receive first sender input, the first sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second sender input comprising a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
> correlate logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the correlate logic configured to correlate each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact; and
> email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session***.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session***" as recited in claim 11, as amended. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses an "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to

the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended, for at least the reason that sending a message to a recipient's identity is different than an email receive window that includes a launch IM option. Additionally, *Knauerhase* discloses that "a user may send a text message – either an e-mail message or an 'instant message' (IM) – to another user... IMs , in contrast, are messages that, if enabled, typically appear instantaneously in a pop-up window on the recipient's monitor" (page 1, paragraph [0003]). However, Applicants respectfully submit that a pop-up window for an Instant messages is different than an email receive window that includes an IM launch window. For at least these reasons, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Donovan* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Knauerhase* and *Cooperman*. More specifically *Donovan* discloses "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended, for at least the reason that an IM session manager is different than an

email window configured for launching an IM session. For at least this reason, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising… email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended. More specifically, *Cooperman* discloses "an IM client application that receives request to initiate IM conversations and, in response to the requests, displays a notification window…" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended, for at least the reason that displaying a notification window is different than an email receive window including a launch IM option. Additionally, nowhere else does *Cooperman* even suggest "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

3. **Claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in View of *Donovan* and *Cooperman***

The Office Action indicates that claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0223069 ("*Cooperman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and Cooperman fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19. More specifically, dependent claims 7 – 10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 6. Further, dependent claims 12 – 19 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 11. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

C. ***Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte***

1. **Claim 1 is Allowable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte***

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0030670 ("*Duarte*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of Duarte fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an instant messaging (IM) address of a contact of a sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an email address of the contact of the sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the contact of the sender;

correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the IM address to the reference identifier;

correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the email address to the reference identifier (ID); and

providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session.*

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses an "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 1, as amended, for at least the reason that sending a message to a recipient's identity is different than an email receive window that includes a launch IM option. Additionally, *Knauerhase* discloses that "a user may send a text message – either an e-mail message or an 'instant message' (IM) – to another user… IMs, in contrast, are messages that, if enabled, typically appear instantaneously in a pop-up window on the recipient's monitor" (page 1, paragraph [0003]). However, Applicants respectfully submit

20

that a pop-up window for an Instant messages is different than an email receive window that includes an IM launch window. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session***" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Duarte* discloses an "improved method of managing multiple email sessions" (page 2, paragraph [0018]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session***" as recited in claim 1, as amended, for at least the reason that managing multiple email sessions is different than an email receive window including a launch IM option. Additionally, nowhere else does *Duarte* even suggest "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email receive window, ***the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session***" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

2. Claims 2 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in View of *Duarte*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0030670 ("*Duarte*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 – 5. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 5 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

D. ***Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte***

1. **Claim 6 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in View of *Donovan* and *Duarte***

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0793722 ("*Donovan*") and U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0030670 ("*Duarte*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, sender input, the sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID); and
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for

launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*.
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses an "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended, for at least the reason that sending a message to a recipient's identity is different than an email receive window that includes a launch IM option. Additionally, *Knauerhase* discloses that "a user may send a text message – either an e-mail message or an 'instant message' (IM) – to another user... IMs , in contrast, are messages that, if enabled, typically appear instantaneously in a pop-up window on the recipient's monitor" (page 1, paragraph [0003]). However, Applicants respectfully submit that a pop-up window for an Instant messages is different than an email receive window that includes an IM launch window. For at least these reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Donovan* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Knauerhase*. More specifically, *Donovan* discloses "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended, for at least the reason that an IM session manager is different than an email window configured for launching an IM session. For at least this reason, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, *Duarte* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Knauerhase* and *Donovan*. More specifically, *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Duarte* discloses an "improved method of managing multiple email sessions" (page 2, paragraph [0018]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Duarte* even suggest "providing, by the computing

24

device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 6, as amended, for at least the reason that managing multiple email sessions is different than an email receive window including a launch IM option. For at least these additional reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

2. Claim 11 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in View of *Donovan* and *Duarte*

The Office Action indicates that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0793722 ("*Donovan*") and U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0030670 ("*Duarte*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. More specifically, claim 11 recites:

> A system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising:
> first receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the first receive logic configured to receive first sender input, the first sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second sender input comprising a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
> correlate logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the correlate logic configured to correlate each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact; and
> email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received

email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*.
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising… email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses an "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended, for at least the reason that sending a message to a recipient's identity is different than an email receive window that includes a launch IM option. Additionally, *Knauerhase* discloses that "a user may send a text message – either an e-mail message or an 'instant message' (IM) – to another user… IMs , in contrast, are messages that, if enabled, typically appear instantaneously in a pop-up window on the recipient's monitor" (page 1, paragraph [0003]). However, Applicants respectfully submit that a pop-up window for an Instant messages is different than an email receive window that includes an IM launch window. For at least these reasons, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Donovan* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Knauerhase*. More specifically *Donovan* discloses "IM session manager software (an IM manager) which is used to establish and monitor each IM session including receiving and responding to commands from the user related to the instant messaging function and displaying information to the user related to the IM function" (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended, for at least the reason that an IM session manager is different than an email window configured for launching an IM session. For at least this reason, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, *Duarte* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Knauerhase* and *Donovan*. More specifically, *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising… email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended. More specifically, *Duarte* discloses an "improved method of managing multiple email sessions" (page 2, paragraph [0018]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended, for at least the reason that managing multiple

email sessions is different than an email receive window including a launch IM option.
Additionally, nowhere else does *Duarte* even suggest "email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, an email receive window configured to display a received email, the email receive window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window, *the email receive window including a launch IM option for launching the IM session*" as recited in claim 11, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

3. Claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in View of *Donovan* and *Duarte*

The Office Action indicates that claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0793722 ("*Donovan*") and U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0030670 ("*Duarte*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19. More specifically, dependent claims 7 – 10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 6. Further, dependent claims 12 – 19 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 11. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/afb/_____
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
  HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: **38823**